

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 11 2007

REMARKS

I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated April 11, 2007, claims 1, 8, and 15 have been amended. Claims 1-15 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

II. Claim Amendments

Applicants' attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. These amendments were made solely for the purpose of clarifying the language of the claims, and were not required for patentability or to distinguish the claims over the prior art.

III. Examiner's Interview

On July 10, 2007, a telephone interview took place between the Examiner, Msrs. Marx and Brenner, and the undersigned attorney.

The Applicants and the undersigned attorney wish to thank the Examiner for the personal and professional courtesies extended during the interview. Claim 1, and the Hose and Shcha references, were discussed.

IV. Prior Art Rejections

In the Office Action, claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Hose, U.S. Patent 7,024,205 in view of Shcha et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,082,365 (Sheha).

The Hose Reference

Hose merely describes a method and apparatus are disclosed for providing subscriber delivered and personalized location-based services. In one embodiment, the invention is implemented in an intelligent wireless network (100). A subscriber initiates the location-based service process by entering a service request using a wireless telephone (102). The request is transmitted to an intelligent network platform (112) via cell site equipment (108) and MSC (110). An application implementing the process that runs on the platform (112) receives subscriber profile

information (114), location finding equipment inputs (116) and service information (118) related to the service request. Based on these inputs, the application selects location-based service data that is transmitted to the telephone (102) via a data server (120), the MSC (110) and the cell site equipment.

The Sheha Reference

The Sheha reference describes a system for searching and retrieving location information associated with one or more points of interest, wherein the search criteria can be dependent on preferences or search restrictions selected by the user, including rating information about the point of interest. Users can enter their own personal rating information and personal favorites in their own storage area for later retrieval (see Col. 17, lines 28-57).

The Claims are Patentable Over the Cited References

Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are generally directed to methods and systems for providing contextual information about location-based information. A system in accordance with the present invention comprises a computer-based infrastructure, comprising at least one database for storing the commercial location-based information supplied by a commercial entity and the user-supplied location-based information, including a user-supplied location, supplied by a user other than the commercial entity on at least one location, wherein the user directly stores the user-supplied location-based information in the database which is retrievable by at least one other user, a context manager, coupled to the database, for indexing and sorting the commercial location-based information and the user-supplied location-based information stored in the database, a contribution engine, coupled to the database, for entering additional user-supplied location-based information in the database, wherein the user directly enters the additional user-supplied location-based information in the database, a locator, coupled to the contribution engine and the database, for converting a plurality of references to a specific location to a common location designation, a location browser, coupled to the database, for retrieving and reviewing the user-supplied location-based information in the database, and at least one client, which communicates with the infrastructure, for at least entering and editing the user-supplied location-based information in the database.

The cited references do not teach nor suggest these various elements of Applicants' independent claims. Specifically, the cited references do not teach nor suggest the user directly

storing the user-supplied location-based information, including a user-supplied location, in the database which is retrievable by at least one other user as recited in the claims of the present invention.

It is important to note the difference between commercial entries in a database and those provided by users. The references teach location-based services, e.g., finding a local restaurant or hotel, which locations, descriptions, entries and data are provided by commercial interests. These entries in the database are not provided by users; these entries are provided by the hotels or restaurants themselves.

In stark contrast, many users are interested in the history of such locations, and these users place entries into the database for other users to find and review. Sheha and Hose describe the commercial entries in the database, but do not describe a user entry in the database where the user enters the location which is described in the entry.

For example, Hose and Sheha describes the commercial entries relating to restaurants that are either nearby the user's present geolocation, or those entries that have met a certain standard or rating. Sheha does not teach that a user entered specific entries for 'Sandpiper's Seafood House' or 'Angie's Seafood Kitchen' (see Sheha, Col. 14, lines 40-55); these locations were entered by a commercial body, either the system provider or the business owners themselves, such that users can find the location. Sheha, at best, teaches that the commercial entity supplied the location (the geolocation or address of the restaurant) and the user supplied a rating of the restaurant (see Sheha, Col. 12, line 63). The Hose reference does not remedy this deficiency, because Hose does not allow users to enter any information, other than a query of the database to find out what the commercial entities have placed in the database.

Neither Hose nor Sheha allow for a user of the system to enter location-based information that includes a user-supplied location into the database; i.e., nowhere do these references allow for a POI to be entered by a user. The closest Sheha comes is to allow for a user to enter their own personal favorites into a personal database, but that database is only accessible by that particular user (see Sheha, Col. Col. 17, lines 28-57), not by other users, and the POI was provided by the commercial entity, not the user. Hose says nothing about a personal database or users entering location-based information including a user-supplied location.

So, if there were some historical point of interest right next-door to 'Sandpiper's Seafood House' that a local user would know about and want to draw attention to, Sheha (and Hose) would not allow any user to enter that location (i.e., a user-supplied location) into the database that is accessible by other users. The system of Sheha and/or Hose would not encompass this feature; it would only allow commercial entities to enter data to find the restaurant. As such, at least the limitation of the user directly storing the user-supplied location-based information, including a user-supplied location, in the database which is retrievable by at least one other user as recited in the claims of the present invention is not taught by the cited references.

Moreover, the various elements of Applicants' claimed invention together provide operational advantages over Hose and Sheha. In addition, Applicants' invention solves problems not recognized by Hose and Sheha.

Thus, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable over Hose and Sheha. Further, dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14 are submitted to be allowable over Hose and Sheha in the same manner, because they are dependent on independent claims 1, 8 and 15, respectively, and thus contain all the limitations of the independent claims. In addition, dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14 recite additional novel elements not shown by Hose and Sheha.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 11 2007

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

GATES & COOPER LLP
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Howard Hughes Center
6701 Center Drive West, Suite 1050
Los Angeles, California 90045
(310) 641-8797

Date: July 11, 2007

By: 
Name: Anthony J. Orler
Reg. No.: 41,232

AJO/kmk

G&C 200.1-US-U1